-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-

Minutes of the fifth meeting of
The Commission of Fine Arts
during the fiscal year 1912,
held January 25th and 26th, 1912.

-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1912 was held in its Office in the Lemon Building, Washington, D. C., on Thursday and Friday, January 25 and 26, 1912. The following members were present during either the whole or a part of the meeting:

Mr. Burnham, the Chairman,
Mr. Olmsted,
Mr. Hastings,
Mr. French,
Mr. Millet,
Mr. Gilbert,
Mr. Moore;
also Colonel Spencer Cosby, Secretary and Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 10:15 Thursday morning, and immediately proceeded to the business before it.

1. The minutes of the preceding meeting, held December 15, 1911, were presented and approved.

2. The Secretary was authorized to select and purchase a complete set of the New Century Dictionary, Cyclopedia and Atlas for the use of the Commission. He was also authorized to have printed additional copies of the last annual report of the Commission of Fine Arts at a cost not to exceed $75.00.

3. Colonel Cosby read a letter from Mr. Hilles, Secretary to the President, stating that the President would be glad to have the Commission of Fine Arts

pass on the designs for the proposed armory for the National Guard of the District of Columbia. The design and plans for the proposed Armory were examined and discussed, but a decision was deferred until the next meeting in order that additional data may be procured to aid the Commission in its consideration of the matter.

4. Mr. Olmsted's letter of December 9, 1911, was next considered relative to the planting scheme suggested in accordance with the plans of the Park Commission along 15th and 17th streets, adjacent to the Ellipse. The Commission deemed it advisable that studies for the future development of this section be made, and directed that not more than one thousand dollars be used as may be found necessary, either for the purchase of prepared studies, or for expert assistance in their preparation. These studies are to be prepared under the direction of Mr. Olmsted.

5. The Secretary next read a letter from the Secretary of the Lincoln Memorial Commission, transmitting the following resolution adopted at a meeting of that Commission held on January 22, 1912:

> RESOLVED, That the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts be required upon the question of erecting as a Lincoln Memorial an obelisk similar to the Washington Monument, on a suitable site in the District of Columbia.

As the Lincoln Memorial Commission had requested a prompt response, Mr. Millet was directed to prepare the reply to the resolution. This reply, after being read and approved by the members present, was transmitted to the Lincoln Memorial Commission. (See Exhibit A.)

The Secretary also brought to the attention of the Commission a note from Mary Hutchins, Seymour, Indiana, submitting a sketch for a proposed

form of Lincoln Memorial, and a newspaper clipping showing a new scheme for a Lincoln Memorial on the Meridian Hill site, prepared under the direction of Mrs. John B. Henderson. These were ordered placed on file.

6. Colonel Cosby brought up the question of the location of boathouses along the Potomac Park water front. This matter was considered of such importance that, upon motion duly made and seconded, the Chairman appointed Messrs. Olmsted, Millet and Gilbert a committee to consider, and submit a written report upon, the question of the general conditions under which provision should be made for yachting and boating, or other special facilities for recreation in Potomac Park.

7. The Commission gave further consideration to the question of a proper reply to the request of the Engineer Commissioner, D. C., for their criticism and advice in regard to the plans of a colored Normal School proposed to be erected on Georgia avenue. Mr. Hasting's proposed letter was read, and also Mr. Olmsted's proposed modification of it. Mr. Millet and Mr. Olmsted were requested to prepare a report for transmission to the Engineer Commissioner. (See Exhibit B.)

8. The Commission then left the office, and in accordance with the request of the Secretary of War dated January 18, 1912, examined on the fifth floor of the State, War, and Navy Department Building, twelve models submitted in the competition for the erection of a monument by the Government at Guilford Court House, North Carolina. After a careful examination, the Commission adjudged model No. 9, by Augustus Lukeman, sculptor, collaborating with Frederick Roth, sculptor, and Tracy, Swartwout and Litchfield, architects, first in the order of excellence, - model No. 5, by Mr. F. H. Packer,

second in the order of excellence, - and model No. 10, by Henry H. Kitson, third in the order of excellence. A letter containing this recommendation was transmitted to the Secretary of War. (See Exhibit C.)

9. After a short interval for lunch, the Commission went to the National Museum and spent the remainder of the day in the inspection and discussion of the drawings submitted by 54 architects in the competition for the erection of the Perry Memorial at Put-in-Bay, Ohio. By a process of elimination, the list of the submissions considered the most meritorious was narrowed down to six. On Friday morning the Commission again went to the Museum for consideration of the drawings, and there met Mr. Worthington and General Miles, members of the Building Committee of the Interstate Board of the Perry's Victory Centennial Commissioners, and Mr. Webster P. Huntington, Secretary to the Board, with whom they inspected each drawing in turn, explaining its merits and shortcomings. After further careful consideration of the six drawings considered most meritorious, a final vote resulted in the selection of No. 5 as the drawing entitled to the award of the competition, - and of Nos. 17, 34, and 39 as entitled to 1st, 2d, and 3d premiums, respectively. This recommendation was embodied in a letter and immediately transmitted to the Building Committee of the Interstate Board of the Perry's Victory Centennial Commissioners. (See Exhibit D.)

10. Upon motion duly made and seconded the Secretary was directed to keep a record of all designs or plans approved by the Commission, and was authorized to have photographs taken whenever it is considered necessary for the records of the Commission.

11. The Commission adjourned Friday at noon, subject to the call of the Chairman.

(Mr. Burnham had to leave the meeting on Thursday afternoon. Mr. Moore did not arrive until Thursday afternoon, and Mr. Hastings until Friday morning, but both stayed throughout the balance of the meeting. Messrs. Millet, Olmsted, Gilbert, and French were present throughout the whole meeting. Messrs. Millet and Olmsted worked until Saturday noon on the preparation of the various reports assigned to them.)

Approved:

D H Burnham

Chairman.

Secretary.

EXHIBIT A

January 27, 1912.

The Lincoln Memorial Commiasion.

Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, in response to the following resolution of the Lincoln Memorial Commission adopted at a meeting held on January 22, 1912,-

> RESOLVED, That the opinion of the Commission of Fine be required upon the question of erecting as a Lincoln Memorial an obelisk similar to the Washington Monument, on a suitable site in the District of Columbia,-

begs to report that the subject has received careful consideration and that, in the opinion of this Commission, an obelisk similar to the Washington Monument should not be erected as a Lincoln Memorial for the following reasons:

The Washington Monument must, from its form as an obelisk, be classed with innumerable others which have been erected in every country in the civilized world since the type was first developed in Egypt, but it belongs by its enormous size alone in a class by itself, unrivalled and unapproached. Throughout the world this obelisk of stupendous size is known and recognized as the Washington Monument and it is everywhere associated with the memory of Washington. It is recognized as one of the most dignified, impressive and beautiful monuments in existence; and yet, in spite of this admiration, although other countries have erected vast and costly monuments to their

own great men, none has attempted to repeat in memory of another man what has thus become dedicated by common consent to Washington.

The duplication of this great memorial in other countries has not been prevented by respect for the memory of Washington or friendship for this republic but because such a duplication would be a confusion of poverty of invention.

To make the monuments of two great men identical in design could only be justified if they had been joint actors in the same event.

To duplicate the Washington Monument on the Mall or anywhere else as a memorial to Lincoln would, in the opinion of this Commission, be a false artistic expression of the nation's sentiment and would belittle the nation's recognition of each of the two great men.

The communication of Mr. George Keller, architect, of Hartford, recorded in the report of a hearing before the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate, held on March 12, 1904, on "The Mall Parkway" has also received attentive consideration by this Commission as requested. To repeat the Washington Monument in a symmetrical position on the opposite side of the White House axis, as proposed by Mr. Keller, would degrade both great shafts from the function of individual memorials to the position of a pair of colossal ornaments in a badly-conceived architectural scheme.

The argument in favor of twin obelisks might in the future be advanced to permit the erection of a row of such memorials, and as time went on we might have a Cyclopean stockade of obelisks bristling from the Capitol to the Potomac.

Very respectfully,
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,

By F. D. Millet.

Vice-Chairman.

31st January, 1912.

Major W. V. Judson,
Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.,
Engineer Commissioner, D. C.,
Washington, D. C.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts has given careful consideration to the plans for a Colored Normal School building to be erected on Georgia avenue received with your request for consideration and advice.

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts have been in the past, and will continue to be in the future, anxious to give the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the benefit of their experience and knowledge. In order to arrive at the best results in this spasmodic co-operation it is obviously necessary to handle each problem without gloves.

When the designs of the Normal School to be erected at the southwest corner of 11th and Harvard streets, N. W., were submitted to us last year, we were given to understand that the necessity for the prompt erection of the school building and other circumstances made it out of the question to redesign the building completely, and our criticisms and suggestions, both by letter and in personal conferences with the architect, were therefore directed primarily to the amendment of certain features without regard to any change from the Elizabethan style adopted. We called attention, however to the importance of harmony of style in the school houses of the District.

That point was made because we assumed that the building in question, which was not in harmony with the architectural traditions and associations

which have become established in Washington, was the result of individual preference in an isolated case and might be followed by others equally individual in character. But from what was said to us informally by the Municipal Architect and from the present attempt to follow the Elizabethan style in the colored Normal School, there appears to be a deliberate effort to secure a certain consonance among the school buildings by adopting that style for use in all of them.

We are unanimously of the opinion that the Elizabethan style, which was the expression of an age and life quite foreign to our times, and which is peculiarly associated with a different country and a different climate, is ill adapted and inappropriate for public buildings of the present day in Washington.

We believe that we should follow the traditions established by the early architecture in this Capital, which adhered to classical traditions while exhibiting great freedom in adaptation to varying practical requirements, ranging from simple brick structures, such as the Octagon, to the White House itself.

The architecture of today should be evolved from the architecture of those times, adhering to the same classical traditions with equal freedom of expression in the practical solution of every problem.

With these principles in view we recommend that the present design for the Colored Normal School be abandoned and the problem be restudied on the lines suggested above with a view to maintaining the Washington tradition in all future school buildings.

The difficulties of the problem are serious. Everything depends on the architect. He must be a man not only of experience and sound judgment but of discriminating taste, and thoroughly sympathetic with the distinguishing

qualities of the style in which he is to work.

For the Commission of Fine Arts,

Respectfully,

(Signed) F. D. Millet,

Vice-Chairman.

January 26, 1912.

The Honorable

The Secretary of War.

Sir:

In accordance with your request, the Commission of Fine Arts has the honor to report that it has examined the twelve models submitted in the competition for the monument to be erected in commemoration of the Battle of Guilford Court House, North Carolina, and recommends as follows:

First, that the model No. 9, submitted by Augustus Lukeman, collaborating with Frederick Roth, sculptor, and Tracy, Swartwout and Litchfield, architects, be adjudged the best; and that the contract for the execution of the monument be awarded to him, with the provision that certain modifications of the architectural treatment be made. The Commission reached this decision because in its opinion the equestrian figure and its pedestal are sufficiently satisfactory to warrant its acceptance in spite of certain defects of minor architectural features which can be restudied without changing the essential lines of the composition. The Commission will advise further in regard to this, if desired by the Secretary of War.

Second, that the model No. 5, submitted by F. H. Packer, be adjudged second in order of excellence, and be awarded the second honorarium. In this model the architectural setting is of such a character that a modification of it, which would make it more reasonably subordinate to the statue and suitable for the site, would necessarily involve an entire change in

the composition.

Third, that the model No. 10, submitted by Henry H. Kitson, be adjudged to be third in order of excellence, and be awarded the third honorarium. The judgment of the Commission is based on the general effect of this composition as a satisfactory solution of a problem in which architecture plays an important part. The equestrian figure, however, which should be the dominant note of the composition, does not give promise of successful accomplishment.

The Commission recognizes the merit of the rendering of the sculpture on Model No. 1, by J. Otto Schweizer, but does not recommend an award for this design for the reason that, in its opinion, the band of relief surrounding the base of the pedestal is of distracting importance and if executed in any material would cut the monument in two and disturb the harmony of the composition.

By direction of the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully,

SPENCER COSBY,

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary.

EXHIBIT D

January 26, 1912.

The Building Committee
of The Inter-State Board of the
Perry's Victory Centennial Commissioners.

Gentlemen:

Under the terms of the program of competition for the Perry Memorial we beg to advise you as follows:

We select design number five as presenting the most satisfactory solution of the problem and we recommend that its author be appointed as architect.

In making this selection we heartily commend the design for its great beauty and for its significant appropriateness as the memorial of both a victory in battle and a century of peace and a friendship between two nations. The design indicates that its author is thoroughly trained and has the skill and capacity to execute successfully the work to be entrusted to him.

For the first premium we name design number seventeen, which more nearly approaches the excellence of design number five than any other in the competition. For the second and third premiums we name respectively designs number thirty-four and number fifty-four.

We hereby certify that designs number five, number seventeen, number thirty-four, and number fifty-four comply with the mandatory requirements of the program.

We have not found it necessary to ascertain whether each of the re-

maining designs complies with all these requirements, but we certify that two designs, namely, number one and number twenty-one have violated mandatory requirements. Even if designs number one and number twenty-one had not violated these requirements it would have made no difference in our advice to you because neither of them approaches the standard of those considered for award.

The number of designs submitted and the serious study and effort proven by the variety of these designs and the quality of the technical execution of the drawings indicate a wide-spread interest in the competition among the most capable architects of the country.

By direction of the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully,

SPENCER COSBY,

Colonel, U. S. Army,

Secretary.



PERRY MEMORIAL COMPETITION.

Philadelphia, Jan. 30, 1912.

To the Competitors for the Perry Memorial:

Gentlemen:-

I beg to report that on Saturday January twentieth 1912, fifty-four sets of competitive drawings were received and hung at the New National Museum, Washington, D. C.

The Commission of Fine Arts having examined the drawings on Jan. 24, 25 and 26 rendered its report as follows:

January 26, 1912.

The Building Committee
of The Inter-State Board of the
Perry's Victory Centennial Commissioners.

Gentlemen:

Under the terms of the program of competition for the Perry Memorial we beg to advise you as follows:

We select design number five as presenting the most satisfactory solution of the problem and we recommend that its author be appointed as architect.

In making this selection we heartily commend the design for its great beauty and for its significant appropriateness as the memorial of both a victory in battle and a century of peace and friendship between two nations. The design indicates that its author is thoroughly trained and has the skill and capacity to execute successfully the work to be entrusted to him.

For the first premium we name design number seventeen, which more nearly approaches the excellence of design number five than any other in the competition. For the second and third premiums we name respectively designs number thirty-four and number fifty-four.

We hereby certify that designs number five, number seventeen, number thirty-four, and number fifty-four comply with the mandatory requirements of the program.

We have not found it necessary to ascertain whether each of the remaining designs complies with all these requirements, but we certify that two designs, namely, number one and number twenty-one have violated mandatory requirements. Even if designs number one and number twenty-one had not violated these requirements it would have made no difference in our advice to you because neither of them approaches the standard of those considered for award.

The number of designs submitted and the serious study and effort proven by the variety of these designs and the quality of the technical execution of the drawings indicate a wide-spread interest in the competition among the most capable architects of the country.

By direction of the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully,
SPENCER COSBY,
Colonel, U. S. Army,
Secretary.

The Building Committee inspected the drawings January 26 and 27 and on January 29th submitted to the Executive Committee a report recommending the acceptance of the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Executive Committee presented these reports to the Inter-State Board at a meeting held January 29th and that Board made its award of the prize to the author of design number five, and appointed him Architect of the Memorial. It also awarded the first premium to design number seventeen; the second to number thirty-four, and the third to number fifty-four.

Colonel Spencer Cosby having presented the sealed envelopes containing the names of competitors they were then opened upon which it appeared that design number five was by J. H. Freedlander and A. D. Seymour, associated.

It also appeared that the design numbered seventeen was by James Gamble Rogers; the design numbered thirty-four was by Paul P. Cret; the design numbered fifty-four was by Dillon, McLellan and Beadle.

Upon opening the remaining envelopes it appeared that the following fifty architects had also submitted designs:
Abbott and Shattuck; Allen & Collens; Bosworth & Holden; W. W. Bosworth; Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson; Walter B. Chambers; Shiras Campbell Edw. Pearce Casey; Cook & Welch and Lawrence Peck, Associated; Delano & Aldrich; D'Oench & Yost; Wilson Eyre; Ellicott & Emmart; John Eisenmann; Ewing & Chappell; Ernest Flagg; Abram Garfield; John C. Greenleaf; Griffin & Wynkoop; Hood & Ferrand; Howes & Morse; Wm. C. Hays; Howells & Stokes; Haight & Githens; Hunt & Hunt; Hewett, Granger & Paist; Chas. P. Huntington; Edgar A. Josselyn; Beverly S. King; Lord, Hewlett & Tallant; Lehmann & Schmidt; Louis Christian Mullgardt; Ch. Morris; H. van Buren Magonigle; Gustav A. Mueller; Nelson & Van Wagenen; Frank E. Newman; Neff & Thompson; Ch. F. Owsley; John Russell Pope; Albert R. Ross; Renwick, Aspinwall & Tucker; Tietig & Lee; Edward L. Tilton; Tracy, Swartwout & Litchfield; Walker & Chichester; Jas. E. Ware and Son; Ch. Peter Weeks; Wheelwright, Haven & Hoyt; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary.

Before adjournment the Inter-State Board adopted the following vote of thanks to the Competitors:

RESOLVED, that the Inter-State Board of the Perry's Victory Centennial Commissioners, realizing the deep interest shown by the architects who have participated in the competition for the Perry Memorial, and the value of the services performed by them, extends its hearty thanks to them for having enabled it to make choice of an architect through the medium of so many varied and admirable solutions of the problem.

The Board regrets that by the very nature of the case it is unable to requite the competitors in a way that will fully express its obligation to them.

The drawings will remain on Exhibition in Gallery No. 28 at

the New National Museum, 10th and B. Sts., Washington, D. C. from 9 A. M. to 4.30 P. M. from January 31st to February 10th inclusive.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Miles Day

Professional Adviser
to the
Building Committee.

Cards, on Medicine history 1.
thumbtacks, tacks, etc.
at Sammerer's time,
including ~~tips~~ service
of laborer assistants, tips,
etc., dinner downtown. 6

11. 8